

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 7, 2006 has been carefully reviewed. Independent claims 1, 16 and 26 have been amended to address the Examiner's comments and to correct certain claim informalities.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 has been amended to insert "an" in front of "independently executing" and to delete the article "a" following this phrase. It is believed that this corrects the error noted by the Examiner and correctly conveys the idea that there are two separately-executing programs in the processor's memory.

In both claims 1 and 16, "and" has been inserted before "providing control of safety equipment" as suggested by the Examiner and to improve the clarity in these claims

Claim Rejections 35. U.S.C. § 103

Independent claims 1, 16 and 26 are rejected under 35. U.S.C. § 103(a) over Vasko, Rosenquist and the Applicant's admitted prior art.

As discussed in more detail in the previous response to the first Office Action, it is believed none of the art alone or in combination teaches locking program memory for one program while the other is executing to prevent corruption of the nonexecuting program. Nevertheless, the Applicant can see how the claims might be interpreted to cover coincidental locking of a program memory when another program is running and thus has amended each of the independent claims to clearly indicate that there is a step of determining when a program is running, for example, using a scheduled task list, and locking the program based on that determination. By making this step explicit, the claim no longer reads on coincidental program-locking steps.

Vasko, while teaching the simultaneous execution of a safety program and a standard program, does not teach or suggest locking the program memory of the safety program when the standard program is executing. Rosenquist teaches memory locking but only for the purpose of preventing program theft and thus does not teach the step of determining which programs are running and locking selected of the programs to prevent corruption of one program by the other based on that determination. With this clarification, it is believed that claims 1, 16 and 26 are

allowable over the art together with those claims dependent on these claims and therefore that claims 1-26 are now in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES MARTIN RISCHAR ET AL.

By: 

Keith M. Baxter

Reg. No. 31,233

Attorney for Applicant

Boyle Fredrickson Newholm Stein & Gratz, S.C.

250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1030

Milwaukee, WI 53202